

REMARKS

The only issues outstanding in the Office Action mailed February 20, 2008, are the objection to the abstract and drawings, the objection to the specification and the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 102 and 103. Reconsideration of these issues, in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is thanked for noting that claims 8-12 and 16-18 are allowable. It is submitted that, in view of the following discussion, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Abstract

The abstract has been revised, in accordance with the Examiner's request at page 2 of the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Drawings

The drawings have been objected to, as it is argued that various features are not disclosed therein. In view of the cancellation of claims 14 and 15, it is submitted that the new sheet containing Figure 7 shows the features of claim 19, and thus the objection to the drawings is moot. It is noted that the text of the application at page 10 has been clarified in order to highlight the features disclosed in this figure.

Specification

The specification has been clarified at page 8, in order to provide antecedent basis for the features of claim 18. Withdrawal of this objection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 13-15, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

At the outset, it is noted that the rejection now is relevant only to claims 19 and 20. It is

argued that the specification does not disclose the arrangement in claims 19 and 20. However, this is respectfully submitted not to be the case, in view of the discussion in the specification at page 10 highlighting these features. It is submitted that, in view of this discussion, illustrated in new figure 7, the specification is clearly enabling, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Examiner's helpful suggestions in this regard were appreciated. The claims have been revised in order to make various changes of antecedent basis and grammar, with the scope of the claims not being changed by these amendments. It is submitted that withdrawal of these rejections is thus appropriate, and is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and claims 4-7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103. It is submitted that, in view of the amendment to claim 1, incorporating the allowable features of claim 8, these rejections are moot.

The claims of the application are accordingly submitted to be in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at the number below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Harry B. Shubin/

Harry B. Shubin, Reg. No. 32,004
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: LOM-0046

Date: June 20, 2008